



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same body of facts, having the same end in view, shall men who differ by a mental or moral necessity in their conceptions of the path by which the truth is to be reached, oppose one another because of the difference in method? Or shall they rejoice each in the other's work because of their unity of purpose, and their conviction that all honest study must contribute in the end to the discovery of the truth? Without for a moment blinking the fact that such difference in point of view must result in real diversity of judgment even upon questions of great significance, and that these differences call for frank statement and full discussion, we are yet constrained to plead for mutual appreciation and a spirit of co-operation. Our task is a common one; our aim is one. Amid all diversity of method and of view, let us recognize the unity of our purpose, and work side by side as friends, not as foes.

CAN A HIGHER CRITIC SAVE SOULS?

It has been a common charge brought against the historical study of the Bible that it does not "save souls." To complete the argument, attention has been triumphantly called to the fact that "evangelists" are not higher critics. That seemed to end discussion.

For our part, we are inclined to think that the test, while not the only one, is a fair one. But not just as stated. You do not expect to test the value of a chemist's work by comparing him with a cook. Yet both use chemical forces, and the relation of one to the other is not unlike that existing between the technically critical student and the worker in practical religion. Investigation, whether carried on by conservatives, semi-conservatives, or radicals, is not in itself an evangelistic proceeding. Unless we are mistaken, professors of Hebrew, even of the most anti-higher-criticism type, have not reached any particular prominence as evangelists. Criticism and evangelism are two very distinct phases of religious life. Why judge one by the other? Many of the most prominent evangelists have been pre-millennarians; must a man who is not a pre-millennarian despair of being an evangelist?

To say that higher criticism in itself is not a means of saving souls is a very different thing from saying that men under its influence cannot be evangelists or men of real religious influence. The com-

parison should not be drawn between theological professors and evangelists, but between the relative efficiency of ministers who share, and those who do not share, in the general point of view which higher criticism represents. And even here it is not fair to compare failures in one class with successes in another. If comparisons are to be made, at least let them be honest. Once let conditions be fairly equalized, and it will appear that men in sympathy with critical views are just as active and successful; in fact, from statistics which lie before us, in certain regions they are more active and more successful than men not in sympathy with such views.

The test of efficiency is legitimate and desirable. If critical methods make men less effective, it is certainly a serious outlook for the church. The methods themselves cannot be abandoned. They are right. It is therefore a reassuring thing to find that in the case of hundreds of young men who in the last ten years have gone out into the ministry trained under the influence of men holding the critical view of the Scriptures there is to be found an increase rather than a decline in religious zeal.

An interesting illustration of this is the evangelistic campaign being conducted by Dr. William J. Dawson. As America sends an anti-critical evangelist to Great Britain, so Great Britain sends a genuinely modern man to help save America. Dr. Dawson is in sympathy with modern scholarship, and in that spirit has written an exceedingly beautiful, altogether too little known, "Life of Christ." Yet men are being turned away by the hundreds from his meetings in Boston. It is true that they are from the more intelligent classes; but even intelligent people are worth saving. Why not save them?

Let us be willing to do as Peter and Paul did, divide the work of evangelization. Some men want the gospel preached from one point of view; others want it preached from another. Some men like a Peter; others like a Paul. There is only one gospel. But today, as in the day of the council at Jerusalem, there are all sorts of men to be saved. Why assume that they are all subject to the same sort of intellectual appeal?